



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/751,530

01/06/2004

Junichi Komagata

SON-2895

3306

23353 7590 06/16/2008  
RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC  
LION BUILDING  
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

SOL, ANTHONY M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2619

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/16/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/751,530	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KOMAGATA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ANTHONY SOL	<b>Art Unit</b> 2619	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

- A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on 4/8/2008 has been entered.

- Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6 have been amended.
- Claims 7 and 8 have been canceled.
- Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6 remain pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,560,230 B1 ("Li").

Regarding claims 1 and 4,

Li shows in fig. 5A a storing portion 55 for storing first packets that compose the real time streams (fig. 4, voice 40) and second packets that compose the non-real time stream (fig. 4, HTTP 48 and other 46) so that a first-in-first-out operation is respectively performed for every stream (col. 8, lines 47-48, *Queues 55 are logical first in, first out ("FIFO") queues*); and a counter portion for counting (col. 4, lines 39-40, *a **counter** for maintaining a virtual time for the scheduling engine*) an interval time (col. 10, lines 1-5, *If a packet 51 of length  $L$  were transmitted at a rate  $R$ , its transmission will be completed after an **interval  $I$**  given by:  $I=L/R$ ) of the first packets for every said real time stream; and a scheduler portion for transmitting the first packets stored for every said real time stream in the storing portion every said interval time period (col. 4, lines 39-49, *a **scheduling engine** adapted to select one packet from a plurality of packets at the heads of the queues*), calculating a transmission end time of the first packets from the interval time and a transmission time of the first packets of each of the real time streams for every said real time stream and transmitting a first packet whose transmission end time is the earliest in the first packets when the transmission times of the first packets overlap (col. 11, lines 46-48, *A simplified method is possible whereby leaf scheduling engine 60 simply selects for transmission the packet which has the **smallest finish time  $F$*** ; col. 13, lines 35-44, *The method continues by passing the one high priority packet having the smallest finish time  $F$  (fig. 8, step 206), and transmitting the second packets when the transmission intervals of said first packets are longer than the transmission times of the second packets (see col. 15, lines 22-29, *When a parent scheduling engine 60 selects a packet from one of its child scheduling engines 60, it***

*initially considers only the highest priority packets being held by the child scheduling engines 60. If none of those packets are eligible, it considers the next highest priority packets being held by the child scheduling engines 60).*

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,539,729 ("Bodnar").

Regarding claims 3 and 6,

Li discloses When a parent scheduling engine 60 selects a packet from one of its child scheduling engines 60, it initially considers only the highest priority packets being held by the child scheduling engines 60. If none of those packets are eligible, it considers the next highest priority packets being held by the child scheduling engines 60. The parent scheduling engine 60 continues checking for packets of ever lower priority until it finds an eligible packet. *If no eligible packets are found, but the child scheduling engines 60 are holding on to one or more packets, **the virtual time of the parent scheduling engine 60 is advanced to the earliest start time** of those packets being held* (claimed a scheduler portion is configured to treat times shorter than the

transmission times of the second packets as new transmission times of the second packets)(see col. 15, lines 22-34).

Li does not disclose that this step occurs when the second packets are not transmitted while a predetermined number of the first packets are transmitted.

Bodnar discloses that a counter is associated with the higher priority packet stream, so that **when the counter reaches a predetermined number, the higher priority packet stream is disabled, so that the lower priority packet stream may be processed**. Advantageously, the counter may be set to a predetermined value and then decremented, so that when the counter reaches zero, the higher priority packet stream is disabled. Advantageously, a predetermined number of lower priority packets are processed before processing is re-enabled on the higher priority packet system and the counter reset. Advantageously, when the higher priority packet stream is interrupt-driven, interrupts are disabled and then enabled after a predetermined number of packets are processed from the lower priority stream (see col. 3, lines 9-27).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the reverse packet scheduling method of Li to use a counter to limit processing of high priority packet stream in order to process lower priority packet stream as taught by Bodnar. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the combination in order to transmit "real time" packets with very small delays but which can also schedule the transmission of non-real time packets fairly (see Li, col. 3, lines 50-53).

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gorti (US2003/0189943A1) teaches priority based bandwidth allocation within real-time and non-real-time traffic streams.

Wang (US2004/0004971A1) teaches multilevel queuing assigning credits to each priority queue.

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY SOL whose telephone number is (571)272-5949. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30am - 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing Chan can be reached on (571) 272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2619

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Anthony Sol/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2619  
6/16/2008

/Wing F. Chan/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2619  
6/11/08